

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
09/747,668	12/21/2000	Ravi Jagannathan	47242.00013	4625		
7590 09/08/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER		
Ravi Jagannathan			VANDERPUYE, KENNETH N			
1 Maple Street #2108			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Redwood City,	CA 94063	94063				
			DATE MAILED: 09/08/200-	DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	Application No.		cant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/747,6	09/747,668 JAGANNATHAN, RAVI		, RAVI		
		Examine	r	Art Unit			
			N Vanderpuye	2661			
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this commun	nication appears on th	e cover sheet with th	ne correspondence a	ddress		
THE M Extensi after SI If the po - If NO po - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN ons of time may be available under the provision X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comeriod for reply specified above is less than thirty ( eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum s to reply within the set or extended period for reply ly received by the Office later than three months patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ev munication. 30) days, a reply within the stat tatutory period will apply and w y will, by statute, cause the ap	rent, however, may a reply b tutory minimum of thirty (30) rill expire SIX (6) MONTHS i blication to become ABAND	pe timely filed  days will be considered time from the mailing date of this ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ely. communication.		
Status	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,						
	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on					
·	, , ,	ed on 2b)⊠ This action is r	non-final				
· <del></del>		·		prosecution as to th	a marite ie		
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositio	n of Claims						
4a 5)□ C 6)⊠ C 7)□ C	Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the a) Of the above claim(s) is/a Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restri	are withdrawn from co					
Application	n Papers						
10)□ TI A R	ne specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on is/are applicant may not request that any objected teplacement drawing sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected the	ection to the drawing(s) of the correction is required.	be held in abeyance. red if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 C	• •		
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)⊡ 1 2 3	cknowledgment is made of a claim  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority  Copies of the certified copies  application from the Internation  the attached detailed Office action	documents have been documents have been of the priority documents back bonal Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Applic ents have been rece le 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this Nationa	l Stage		
Attachment(s	s)						
1) Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summ				
3) 🛛 Informa	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (I tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Ma		O-152)		

Art Unit: 2661

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-19, 21-24, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Ma et al.(5,953,338) in view of Verthein et al.(6,487,196)

With regards to claim 1 Ma teaches a method comprising: receiving a request to make a connection from a calling device to a called device at a predetermined level of QOS(Fig. 8, CAC receives a call request with specified QOS), retrieving resource information from a model to determine whether resources are available to make the connection at the predetermined level(Fig. 8, CAC determines VP group and VP, and if bandwidth is available), providing a ... signal to the calling device if there is insufficient available resources to make the connection at the predetermined QOS(Fig. 8, set alarm, reject BW request, overload condition). What Ma teaches the use of an alarm and not a fast busy signal.

Art Unit: 2661

Verthein teaches the us of a fast busy signal to indicate a busy pone(col. 12 lines 40-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine this feature with Ma for the purpose of using the fast busy signal in place of the alarm. The motivation being that this signal is twice as fast as a normal busy signal.

Claim 2 is rejected because ATM is a packet switched network and so is the internet. Verthein teaches VOIP. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement CAC as taught in Ma in a IP network. The motivation being control the quality of voice calls over the internet.

Claims 3-4 are rejected because Ma teaches a voice connection over an ATM network.

Claims 5-7 are rejected because although Verthein does not teach the different forms, implementing these forms of the fast busy signal is obvious as a matter of design choice. It would have been obvious to combine Verthein with Ma for the same purpose as stated above.

Claim 8 is rejected because Ma uses available BW status to determine call connection.

Art Unit: 2661

Claims 10-11 are rejected because in ATM the caller in some instances has established a contract with the service provider hence the CAC has information about the calling device. The CAC is also aware of the nodes along the path between caller and called parties.

With regards to claim 12, 19, Ma teaches a data network switch comprising: a softswitch(Fig. 1B@130A) a calling device and a called device(Fig. 1B@110K, 110I, client of the networks), a communications path between the calling and called devices(Fig. 1B), and a RIS coupled to the softswitch(Fig. 1B@160), the RIS having access to a model containing information about resources on the data network(Fig. 1B@145), wherein the RIS is operable to inform the softwitch to initiate the sending of a signal(alarm) if the are insufficient resources(BW) to make the connection along the communications path at a predetermined QOS. (Fig. 8, set alarm, reject BW request, overload condition). ). What Ma teaches the use of an alarm and not a fast busy signal. Verthein teaches the us of a fast busy signal to indicate a busy pone(col. 12 lines 40-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine this feature with Ma for the purpose of using the fast busy signal in place of the alarm. The motivation being that this signal is twice as fast as a normal busy signal.

Art Unit: 2661

Claims 14-15 are rejected because the customer network in Ma is a Lan capable of both computer and telephone devices.

Claims 16-18, 22-23 are rejected because ATM is a packet switched network and so is the internet. Verthein teaches VOIP. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement CAC as taught in Ma in a IP network. The motivation being control the quality of voice calls over the internet.

Claims 20-21 are rejected because Ma teaches a connection for voice over ATM(CBR traffic), ATM is capable of supporting multimedia traffic.

Claim 24 is rejected because the QOS in MA refers to bandwidth

Claims 9, 13, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ma and Verthein as applied to claims 1-8, 10-112, 14
19, 21-24 above, and further in view of admitted prior art.

Claims 9, 13, 20 are rejected because although RDF is not taught by both Ma and Verthein, it is well known database storage format(specification p. 12). In Ma the usage monitor keeps track of bandwidth usage in the different VPN groups. It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2661

for one of ordinary skill in the art to store this information in this format. The motivation being easier tracking/accessing QOS information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth N Vanderpuye whose telephone number is 703-308-7828. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(7:30-5:00) Second Friday Off.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KNV 9/6/04

> KENNETH VANDERPUYE PRIMARY EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 09/747,668
Art Unit: 2661

Page 7